

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD
REGION 18**

HOME DEPOT USA, INC.

and

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) an Individual

Case 18-CA-273796

AMENDED COMPLAINT AND ORDER RESCHEDULING HEARING

This Amended Complaint and Order Rescheduling Hearing is based on a charge filed by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (an Individual), against The Home Depot USA, Inc. (Respondent). It is issued pursuant to Section 10(b) of the National Labor Relations Act (the Act), 29 U.S.C. § 151 et seq., and Sections 102.15, 102.16, and 102.17 of the Rules and Regulations of the National Labor Relations Board (the Board), and the Complaint and Notice of Hearing issued on August 12, 2021, is amended as follows:

1. (a) The charge in this proceeding was filed by the Charging Party on March 8, 2021, and a copy was served on Respondent by first-class mail on about March 9, 2021.
- (b) The first amended charge in this proceeding was filed by the Charging Party on April 7, 2021, and a copy was served on Respondent by first-class mail on about April 8, 2021.
- (c) The second amended charge in this proceeding was filed by the Charging Party on July 27, 2021, and a copy was served on Respondent by first-class mail on about the same date.

2. (a) At all material times, Respondent has been a Delaware corporation with an office and place of business in New Brighton, Minnesota (the New Brighton Facility), and has been engaged in the sale and delivery of home improvement merchandise.


(b) In conducting its operations described above in subparagraph (a), during the calendar year ending December 31, 2020, Respondent derived gross revenues in excess of \$500,000.

(c) In conducting its operations described above in subparagraph (a), during the calendar year ending December 31, 2020, Respondent purchased and received goods valued in excess of \$50,000 at its New Brighton Facility directly from points located outside the State of Minnesota.

(d) At all material times, Respondent has been an employer engaged in commerce within the meaning of Section 2(2), (6) and (7) of the Act.

3. At all material times, the following individuals held the positions set forth opposite their respective names and have been supervisors of Respondent within the meaning of Section 2(11) of the Act and agents of Respondent within the meaning of Section 2(13) of the Act:

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)



(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

4. (a) At all material times, Respondent, at its facilities in the United States, has maintained and enforced dress code and apron policies, which, in relevant part, prohibit “[d]isplaying causes or political messages unrelated to workplace matters.”

(b) At all material times, Respondent, at its facilities in the United States, has unlawfully applied and/or directed its managers and/or supervisors to unlawfully apply the policy described above in subparagraph 4(a) to employees displaying “BLM” and/or “Black Lives Matter”.

(c) About (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) 2021, Respondent, by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) enforced the rule described above in paragraph 4(a) selectively and disparately by applying it against employees who displayed the slogan “BLM” on their aprons and engaged in other related protected concerted activities.

5. (a) Beginning about August 2020, Respondent's employee (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) engaged in concerted activities for the purposes of mutual aid and protection related to racial policies and practices at the New Brighton Facility; this included displaying the lettering “BLM” on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) apron, writing emails, engaging in various conversations with coworkers, supervisors, and managers about subjects such as ongoing discrimination and harassment, and/or engaging in other BLM-related protected concerted activity.

(b) About the middle of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) 2021, Respondent required (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) to choose between engaging in protected concerted activity, including displaying the “BLM” slogan, and leaving the New Brighton Facility.

(c) By the conduct described above in subparagraph 5(b), Respondent caused the suspension of its employee (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

(d) About (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) 2021, Respondent required (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) to choose between engaging in protected concerted activity, including displaying the “BLM” slogan, and quitting (b) (6), employment.

(e) By the conduct described above in subparagraph 5(d), Respondent caused the termination of its employee (b) (6), (b) (7)(C).

(f) Respondent engaged in the conduct described above in subparagraphs 5(b) through 5(e) because (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) engaged in the conduct described above in subparagraph 5(a), and to discourage employees from engaging in these or other concerted activities.

6. (a) On about February 14, 2021, Respondent, by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) or (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), in an office at the New Brighton Facility, threatened employees with unspecified consequences if they engaged in protected concerted activities regarding racial harassment.

(b) On about February 15, 2021, Respondent, by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), via video call, threatened employees with unspecified consequences if they engaged in protected concerted activities regarding racial harassment.

7. By the conduct described above in paragraphs 4, 5, and 6, Respondent has been interfering with, restraining, and coercing employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in Section 7 of the Act, in violation of Section 8(a)(1) of the Act.

8. The unfair labor practices of Respondent described above affect commerce within the meaning of Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act.

WHEREFORE, as part of the remedy for the unfair labor practices alleged above, the General Counsel seeks an order requiring that Respondent:

Rescind the unlawfully-applied dress code and apron policies described above in paragraph 4(a) through 4(c) at all Respondent facilities where those policies are in effect and provide appropriate notification to all employees at those facilities of such rescission. Should Respondent wish to reinstate the policies, Respondent must include therein a disclaimer that Respondent will not apply the policies to Section 7 activities.

The General Counsel further seeks all other relief as may be just and proper to remedy the unfair labor practices alleged.

RESPONDENT IS FURTHER NOTIFIED that, pursuant to Sections 102.20 and 102.21 of the Board's Rules and Regulations, Respondent(s) must file an answer to the above amended complaint. **The answer must be received by this office on or before September 27, 2021, or postmarked on or before September 26, 2021**. Respondent should file an original and four copies of the answer with this office and serve a copy of the answer on each of the other parties.

An answer may also be filed electronically through the Agency's website. To file electronically, go to www.nlrb.gov, click on **File Case Documents**, enter the NLRB Case Number, and follow the detailed instructions. The responsibility for the receipt and usability of the answer rests exclusively upon the sender. Unless notification on the Agency's website informs users that the Agency's E-Filing system is officially determined to be in technical failure because it is unable to receive documents for a continuous period of more than 2 hours after 12:00 noon (Eastern Time) on the due date for filing, a failure to timely file the answer will not be excused on the basis that the transmission could not be accomplished because the Agency's website was off-line or unavailable for some other reason. The Board's Rules and Regulations require that an answer be

signed by counsel or non-attorney representative for represented parties or by the party if not represented. See Section 102.21. If the answer being filed electronically is a pdf document containing the required signature, no paper copies of the answer need to be transmitted to the Regional Office. However, if the electronic version of an answer to a complaint is not a pdf file containing the required signature, then the E-filing rules require that such answer containing the required signature continue to be submitted to the Regional Office by traditional means within three (3) business days after the date of electronic filing. Service of the answer on each of the other parties must still be accomplished by means allowed under the Board's Rules and Regulations. The answer may not be filed by facsimile transmission. If no answer is filed, or if an answer is filed untimely, the Board may find, pursuant to a Motion for Default Judgment, that the allegations in the amended complaint are true.

ORDER RESCHEDULING HEARING

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the hearing in the above-entitled matter is rescheduled from 9:00 a.m. on October 4, 2021 to 9:00 a.m. on November 2, 2021, and on consecutive days thereafter until concluded. The hearing will be conducted before an administrative law judge of the National Labor Relations Board via ZOOM/video conference or in a manner and location otherwise ordered by the Regional Director and/or the Administrative Law Judge.¹

At the hearing, Respondent and any other party to this proceeding have the right to appear and present testimony regarding the allegations in this complaint. The procedures to be followed

¹ Details regarding how to connect to the hearing will follow. The parties are urged in the meantime to consult and cooperate with the Division of Judges or the assigned Judge regarding how the Judge will conduct the hearing, including how the parties will prepare witnesses, number and offer documents and exhibits, and whether there will be public access to the hearing.

at the hearing are described in the attached Form NLRB-4668. The procedure to request a postponement of the hearing is described in the attached Form NLRB-4338.

Dated: September 13, 2021



JENNIFER HADSALL
REGIONAL DIRECTOR
NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD
REGION 18
Federal Office Building
212 3rd Avenue South, Suite 200
Minneapolis, MN 55401-2657

Attachments

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT
NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD
NOTICE

Case 18-CA-273796

The issuance of the notice of formal hearing in this case does not mean that the matter cannot be disposed of by agreement of the parties. On the contrary, it is the policy of this office to encourage voluntary adjustments. The examiner or attorney assigned to the case will be pleased to receive and to act promptly upon your suggestions or comments to this end.

An agreement between the parties, approved by the Regional Director, would serve to cancel the hearing. However, unless otherwise specifically ordered, the hearing will be held at the date, hour, and place indicated. Postponements ***will not be granted*** unless good and sufficient grounds are shown ***and*** the following requirements are met:

- (1) The request must be in writing. An original and two copies must be filed with the Regional Director when appropriate under 29 CFR 102.16(a) or with the Division of Judges when appropriate under 29 CFR 102.16(b).
- (2) Grounds must be set forth in ***detail***;
- (3) Alternative dates for any rescheduled hearing must be given;
- (4) The positions of all other parties must be ascertained in advance by the requesting party and set forth in the request; and
- (5) Copies must be simultaneously served on all other parties (listed below), and that fact must be noted on the request.

Except under the most extreme conditions, no request for postponement will be granted during the three days immediately preceding the date of hearing.

Taylor Flemming, Specialty ASM
The Home Depot
1520 New Brighton Blvd
Minneapolis, MN 55413

C. Thomas Davis, Attorney
Ogletree, Deakins, Nash, Smoak & Stewart, P.C.
401 Commerce Street, Suite 1200
Nashville, TN 37219-2491
Email: tom.davis@ogletree.com

Keith D. Frazier, Attorney
Ogletree, Deakins, Nash, Smoak & Stewart, P.C.
401 Commerce St, Suite 1200
Nashville, TN 37219
Email: keith.frazier@ogletreedekins.com

Harrison C. Kuntz, Attorney
Ogletree Deakins Nash Smoak & Stewart PC
7700 Bonhomme Avenue, Suite 650
Saint Louis, MO 63105-0030
Email: harrison.kuntz@ogletree.com

Brian E. Hayes, Attorney
Ogletree, Deakins, Nash, Smoak & Stewart, P.C.
1909 K Street, N.W., Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20006-1134
Email: brian.hayes@ogletree.com

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Email: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Procedures in NLRB Unfair Labor Practice Hearings

The attached complaint has scheduled a hearing that will be conducted by an administrative law judge (ALJ) of the National Labor Relations Board who will be an independent, impartial finder of facts and applicable law. **You may be represented at this hearing by an attorney or other representative.** If you are not currently represented by an attorney, and wish to have one represent you at the hearing, you should make such arrangements as soon as possible. A more complete description of the hearing process and the ALJ's role may be found at Sections 102.34, 102.35, and 102.45 of the Board's Rules and Regulations. The Board's Rules and regulations are available at the following link: www.nlrb.gov/sites/default/files/attachments/basic-page/node-1717/rules_and_regs_part_102.pdf.

The NLRB allows you to file certain documents electronically and you are encouraged to do so because it ensures that your government resources are used efficiently. To e-file go to the NLRB's website at www.nlrb.gov, click on "e-file documents," enter the 10-digit case number on the complaint (the first number if there is more than one), and follow the prompts. You will receive a confirmation number and an e-mail notification that the documents were successfully filed.

Although this matter is set for trial, this does not mean that this matter cannot be resolved through a settlement agreement. The NLRB recognizes that adjustments or settlements consistent with the policies of the National Labor Relations Act reduce government expenditures and promote amity in labor relations and encourages the parties to engage in settlement efforts.

I. BEFORE THE HEARING

The rules pertaining to the Board's pre-hearing procedures, including rules concerning filing an answer, requesting a postponement, filing other motions, and obtaining subpoenas to compel the attendance of witnesses and production of documents from other parties, may be found at Sections 102.20 through 102.32 of the Board's Rules and Regulations. In addition, you should be aware of the following:

- **Special Needs:** If you or any of the witnesses you wish to have testify at the hearing have special needs and require auxiliary aids to participate in the hearing, you should notify the Regional Director as soon as possible and request the necessary assistance. Assistance will be provided to persons who have handicaps falling within the provisions of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, and 29 C.F.R. 100.603.
- **Pre-hearing Conference:** One or more weeks before the hearing, the ALJ may conduct a telephonic prehearing conference with the parties. During the conference, the ALJ will explore whether the case may be settled, discuss the issues to be litigated and any logistical issues related to the hearing, and attempt to resolve or narrow outstanding issues, such as disputes relating to subpoenaed witnesses and documents. This conference is usually not recorded, but during the hearing the ALJ or the parties sometimes refer to discussions at the pre-hearing conference. You do not have to wait until the prehearing conference to meet with the other parties to discuss settling this case or any other issues.

II. DURING THE HEARING

The rules pertaining to the Board's hearing procedures are found at Sections 102.34 through 102.43 of the Board's Rules and Regulations. Please note in particular the following:

- **Witnesses and Evidence:** At the hearing, you will have the right to call, examine, and cross-examine witnesses and to introduce into the record documents and other evidence.
- **Exhibits:** Each exhibit offered in evidence must be provided in duplicate to the court reporter and a copy of each of each exhibit should be supplied to the ALJ and each party when the exhibit is offered in evidence. If a copy of any exhibit is not available when the original is received, it will be the responsibility

of the party offering such exhibit to submit the copy to the ALJ before the close of hearing. If a copy is not submitted, and the filing has not been waived by the ALJ, any ruling receiving the exhibit may be rescinded and the exhibit rejected.

- **Transcripts:** An official court reporter will make the only official transcript of the proceedings, and all citations in briefs and arguments must refer to the official record. The Board will not certify any transcript other than the official transcript for use in any court litigation. Proposed corrections of the transcript should be submitted, either by way of stipulation or motion, to the ALJ for approval. Everything said at the hearing while the hearing is in session will be recorded by the official reporter unless the ALJ specifically directs off-the-record discussion. If any party wishes to make off-the-record statements, a request to go off the record should be directed to the ALJ.
- **Oral Argument:** You are entitled, on request, to a reasonable period of time at the close of the hearing for oral argument, which shall be included in the transcript of the hearing. Alternatively, the ALJ may ask for oral argument if, at the close of the hearing, if it is believed that such argument would be beneficial to the understanding of the contentions of the parties and the factual issues involved.
- **Date for Filing Post-Hearing Brief:** Before the hearing closes, you may request to file a written brief or proposed findings and conclusions, or both, with the ALJ. The ALJ has the discretion to grant this request and to will set a deadline for filing, up to 35 days.

III. AFTER THE HEARING

The Rules pertaining to filing post-hearing briefs and the procedures after the ALJ issues a decision are found at Sections 102.42 through 102.48 of the Board's Rules and Regulations. Please note in particular the following:

- **Extension of Time for Filing Brief with the ALJ:** If you need an extension of time to file a post-hearing brief, you must follow Section 102.42 of the Board's Rules and Regulations, which requires you to file a request with the appropriate chief or associate chief administrative law judge, depending on where the trial occurred. You must immediately serve a copy of any request for an extension of time on all other parties and furnish proof of that service with your request. You are encouraged to seek the agreement of the other parties and state their positions in your request.
- **ALJ's Decision:** In due course, the ALJ will prepare and file with the Board a decision in this matter. Upon receipt of this decision, the Board will enter an order transferring the case to the Board and specifying when exceptions are due to the ALJ's decision. The Board will serve copies of that order and the ALJ's decision on all parties.
- **Exceptions to the ALJ's Decision:** The procedure to be followed with respect to appealing all or any part of the ALJ's decision (by filing exceptions with the Board), submitting briefs, requests for oral argument before the Board, and related matters is set forth in the Board's Rules and Regulations, particularly in Section 102.46 and following sections. A summary of the more pertinent of these provisions will be provided to the parties with the order transferring the matter to the Board.

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD
REGION 18**

HOME DEPOT USA, INC.

and

Case 18-CA-273796

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) an Individual

ANSWER TO COMPLAINT

Respondent Home Depot USA, Inc. (Respondent), through undersigned counsel and pursuant to Sections 102.20-21 of the Rules and Regulations of the National Labor Relations Board, answers the Complaint and Notice of Hearing (hereinafter “Complaint”) in the above-referenced matter as follows.

Respondent answers the first unnumbered and unlettered paragraph of the Complaint at the first unnumbered page of the Complaint by denying that it has engaged in unfair labor practices as alleged, and otherwise is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the averments of this unnumbered paragraph.

Respondent answers each correspondingly numbered and lettered and unnumbered and unlettered paragraph and subparagraph of the Complaint as follows.

1. (a) Admitted.
(b) Admitted.
(c) Admitted.
2. (a) Admitted.
(b) Admitted.
(c) Admitted.

(d) Admitted.

3. Admitted.

4. Admitted in part and denied in part. Respondent admits that it has maintained and enforced a Home Depot Aprons and a Dress Code HR SOP policy which, in part, restrict the display on The Home Depot apron of messages that “promote or display religious beliefs, causes or political messages unrelated to workplace matters, or messages that would violate our policies on discrimination and unlawful harassment.” Respondent denies that any facilities other than the New Brighton Facility identified in Paragraph 2(a) of the Complaint are covered by, and/or relevant to, the above-captioned Charge.

5. (a) Denied.

(b) Denied.

(c) Denied.

(d) Paragraph 5(d) of the Complaint asserts a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response may be required, Paragraph 5(d) of the Complaint is denied.

(e) Denied.

(f) Paragraph 5(f) of the Complaint asserts a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response may be required, Paragraph 5(f) of the Complaint is denied.

(g) Denied.

6. (a) Denied.

(b) Denied.

7. Denied.

8. Denied.

Respondent responds to the three unnumbered and unlettered “WHEREFORE” paragraph above the heading “Answer Requirement” at the fourth and fifth pages of the Complaint by

denying that the General Counsel and/or (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) are entitled to any remedy or relief in this matter.

Respondent responds to the unnumbered and unlettered paragraphs after the headings “Answer Requirement” and “Notice of Hearing” at the fifth and sixth pages of the Complaint by stating that these are informational paragraphs and do not require an admission or denial from the Respondent.

Respondent further responds to each and every numbered, lettered, unnumbered and unlettered paragraph and subparagraph of the Complaint by stating that any allegation not admitted specifically is denied.

Respondent asserts the following defenses to the Complaint without admitting that it bears the burden of proof for the defenses asserted.

FIRST DEFENSE

Some or all of the claims against Respondent fail because they do not state a claim for which relief may be granted under the National Labor Relations Act (the Act).

SECOND DEFENSE

Some or all of the claims against Respondent fail because the acts alleged are not illegal under the National Labor Relations Act (the Act).

THIRD DEFENSE

The Charging Party did not engage in activities protected by Section 7 of the Act (29 U.S.C. § 157) with respect to Respondent.

FOURTH DEFENSE

Employees do not have a right under Section 7 of the Act to display the phrase “Black Lives Matter” or the initials “BLM” in the workplace.

FIFTH DEFENSE

The Charging Party did not engage in protected, concerted activities.

SIXTH DEFENSE

In the alternative, Respondent's enforcement of its lawful policies in this instance does not violate the Act under the special circumstances present herein.

SEVENTH DEFENSE

The phrase "BLM-related protected concerted activity " as used in Paragraph 5(a) of the Complaint, and the equation of a "BLM" display with protected concerted activity as alleged in Paragraphs 5(b), 5(c), and 5(e) of the Complaint lack entirely any alleged factual predicate warranting such self-contained conclusions; and, accordingly, must be stricken.

EIGHTH DEFENSE

The BLM/Black Lives Matter message is not a message related to issues of workplace concern or employees' interest as employees and thus is not focused on terms and conditions of employment for employees, including Respondent's employees.

NINTH DEFENSE

There is no employee right under the National Labor Relations Act to engage in activities that are merely "concerted" as alleged in Paragraph 5(g) of the Complaint.

TENTH DEFENSE

The Home Depot's name, apron, logo, and the colors thereof are registered and unregistered trademarks. The unauthorized display of a "cause or political message unrelated to workplace matters" in conjunction with such trademarks, and/or any purported right to engage in such display constitutes an impermissible dilution of such trademarks and is inconsistent with 15 U.S.C. §§ 1127, et seq.

ELEVENTH DEFENSE

By maintaining the instant action, the General Counsel is unlawfully infringing upon, and/or diluting Respondent's protected trademark in direct violation of 15 U.S.C. §§ 1127, et seq. Accordingly, the present action and the General Counsel's prosecution of same violates federal law.

TWELFTH DEFENSE

By maintaining the instant action, the General Counsel seeks to compel speech by the Respondent in violation of the Respondent's rights under the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. Accordingly, enforcement of the NLRA in the manner set forth in the Complaint would be unconstitutional.

THIRTEENTH DEFENSE

Respondent's control of the message conveyed by its customer-facing employees in the workplace, including on the Respondent-owned Apron, is protected under the First Amendment. Accordingly, enforcement of the NLRA in the manner set forth in the Complaint would be unconstitutional.

FOURTEENTH DEFENSE

Conditioning Respondent's right to promulgate work rules on the inclusion of specific government-mandated language is beyond the authority of the Agency and violates the First Amendment.

FIFTEENTH DEFENSE

Respondent's enforcement of its policy was not selective.

SIXTEENTH DEFENSE

Respondent's enforcement of its policy was not disparate.

SEVENTEENTH DEFENSE

Neither Respondent nor its agents threatened the Charging Party in any way.

EITHTEENTH DEFENSE

Respondent undertook no adverse action against the Charging Party.

NINETEENTH DEFENSE

Respondent did not suspend the Charging Party.

TWENTIETH DEFENSE

Respondent did not discharge the Charging Party from (b) (6) employment.

TWENTY-FIRST DEFENSE

The Charging Party voluntarily quit (b) (6) employment.

TWENTY-SECOND DEFENSE

Respondent would have undertaken the same actions regarding the Charging Party regardless of any purported Section 7 activities.

TWENTY-THIRD DEFENSE

All purported adverse actions by Respondent against the Charging Party were undertaken for cause as privileged under Section 10(c) of the Act.

TWENTY-FOURTH DEFENSE

The Complaint fails to state facts sufficient to warrant its proposed remediation.

TWENTY-FIFTH DEFENSE

In addition to its previously noted defects, the proposed remediation is fatally overbroad, beyond the Agency's authority, and plainly illogical. The Complaint improperly seeks a "nation-wide" remedy for an alleged single, discrete, "as applied" violation.

TWENTY-SIXTH DEFENSE

Respondent reserves the right, upon any further disclosure of the General Counsel's request

for relief, to assert that some or all of the requests for relief sought against Respondent are, in addition to being unavailable because Respondent did not commit any violations of the Act, beyond the scope permitted by the Act and constitute improper requests for relief, or are punitive requests for relief not permitted by the Act.

TWENTY-SEVENTH DEFENSE

Respondent did not; and did not seek, to discourage any employee from the exercise of their rights under Section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act.

TWENTY-EIGHTH DEFENSE

Respondent's purported conduct as described in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Complaint does not have a reasonable tendency to interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees in the exercise of rights guaranteed by Section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act.

TWENTY-NINTH DEFENSE

To the extent the Complaint's allegations and/or its proposed remediation are (is) predicated, in any way, on any potential change in extant Board law, such retroactive application would be manifestly unfair, unwarranted, and unenforceable.

THIRTIETH DEFENSE

The current General Counsel has no authority to issue or prosecute the Complaint due to the premature and improper removal of the previous National Labor Relations Board General Counsel on January 20, 2021. The General Counsel's improper removal and replacement, before his four-year term ends on or about November 15, 2021, renders the Complaint *ultra vires*.

THIRTY-FIRST DEFENSE

Respondent reserves the right to present additional defenses as permitted by the National Labor Relations Act and the Board's Rules and Regulations.

WHEREFORE, Home Depot USA, Inc., denies that it engaged in any act which violated the National Labor Relations Act. Respondent requests that the Complaint be dismissed in its entirety with prejudice and that Respondent be awarded its costs and attorneys' fees in connection with this matter, and other relief as deemed appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 7, 2021

/s/ C. Thomas Davis

C. Thomas Davis, Esq.

Brian E. Hayes, Esq.

Keith D. Frazier, Esq.

Harrison C. Kuntz, Esq.

**OGLETREE, DEAKINS, NASH, SMOAK
& STEWART, P.C.**

SunTrust Plaza

401 Commerce Street

Suite 1200

Nashville, TN 37219-2446

Tel.: 615-687-2232|

Fax: 615-254-1908

tom.davis@ogletree.com

brian.hayes@ogletree.com

keith.frazier@ogletree.com

harrison.kuntz@ogletree.com

Attorneys for Respondent

Home Depot USA, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 7th day of September, 2021 I filed the foregoing ANSWER TO COMPLAINT via the National Labor Relations Board's E-File system, and served the same to the following parties via electronic mail:

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Charging Party
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
[Redacted]

Jennifer A. Hadsall, Regional Director
National Labor Relations Board
Region 18
212 3rd Avenue S, Suite 200
Minneapolis, MN 55401
jennifer.hadsall@nlrb.gov

David Stolzberg, Attorney
National Labor Relations Board
212 3rd Avenue South, Suite 200
Minneapolis, MN 55401
david.stolzberg@nlrb.gov
Counsel for the General Counsel

/s/ C. Thomas Davis
C. Thomas Davis

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD
REGION 18

HOME DEPOT USA, INC.

and

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C), An Individual

Case 18-CA-273796

**ORDER REFERRING PETITION TO REVOKE
SUBPOENA DUCES TECUM TO ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE**

On September 9, 2021, counsel for Respondent Home Depot USA, Inc. filed with the Regional Director, Home Depot U.S.A., Inc.'s Petition to Revoke Subpoena Duces Tecum. A copy of the Petition is attached.

IT IS ORDERED, pursuant to Section 102.31(b) of the Board's Rules and Regulations, that the Petition is hereby referred to the Administrative Law Judge for ruling. Counsel for the General Counsel will file an Opposition to the Petition after consultation with the Office of the General Counsel. Opposition will be filed on or before September 20, 2021.

Dated: September 14, 2021



JENNIFER HADSALL
REGIONAL DIRECTOR
NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD
REGION 18
Federal Office Building
212 3rd Avenue South, Suite 200
Minneapolis, MN 55401-2657